

not take cognisance. I would like to know if there is any other order and I wish the Minister would say it.

**Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.**—I wanted to suggest at that time that because the Minister wanted to speak on the merits and wanted to give details by making a statement, it would be desirable to hear what the mover had to say. Since the Minister has already made a statement on that point, perhaps the mover will take the opportunity of confirming it or not.

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—At this stage, I would like to bring to the notice of the House that the matter is *sub judice*. Two cases have been registered by the Police in Crime No. 65 of 52-53, Ramanagaram, which is already in the First Class Magistrate's Court and the hearing is on 26th June 1952, *i.e.*, 515 of 52-53. In respect of the other case referred to in the adjournment motion, that certain things happened on that particular day, I may be permitted to say that a case has been registered in Crime No. 86 of 52 under Section 107 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Preliminary order was passed under Section 112.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—What is the date of that order?

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—The preliminary order was passed.....I have not got that particular date. But it is prior to 14th July 1952. Before the tabling of this adjournment motion, the preliminary order was already passed and served on the individuals and the case is pending before the Magistrate.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I have adopted a very unusual procedure while allowing the Hon'ble Member to go into the facts of the case, for the simple reason that this particular adjournment motion has had a special significance as has been explained by the Leader of the House. We have heard the statements made both by the Hon'ble Minister and the Leader of the Opposition and also the mover of the adjournment motion. Without going into this question in greater detail, it is to be said that the matter is not urgent within the meaning of the rules. Further, it is doubtful

whether it is of sufficient public importance as to upset the appointed course of business to-day. In view of the detailed statement made by the Hon'ble Ministers, that is the Home Minister and the Leader of the House, I expect the mover is satisfied. Further, no purpose will be served by a debate. In fact, under the rules, the motion is not admissible. But I permitted the Hon'ble Minister to make a statement to satisfy the mover of the Motion. Under the circumstances, this adjournment motion need not be taken up for discussion.

**Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.**—I am not satisfied, Sir.....

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The Hon'ble Member is not required to make any statement after the ruling.

### The Mysore Town Areas Bill, 1952.

#### *Motion to Consider.*

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Discussion on the motion to consider the Mysore Town Areas Bill will be resumed.

**Sri N. HUTCHAMASTHYGOWDA (Huliyurdurga).**—Sir, I move the following amendment:

“That the Mysore Town Areas Bill, 1952, be circulated for eliciting public opinion before the end of September, 1952.”

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Amendment moved:

“That the Mysore Town Areas Bill, 1952, be circulated for eliciting public opinion before the end of September, 1952.”

This was the suggestion made yesterday by Sri Pattabhiraman and Sri B. Hutche Gowda. The House, I presume, has no objection to this amendment being passed.

The question is:

“That the Mysore Town Areas Bill, 1952, be circulated for eliciting public opinion before the end of September, 1952.”

*The motion was adopted.*